Cultural and Linguistic Diversity in Higher Education

FIDEL MOLINA (molina@geosoc.udl.es), Faculty of Education, University of Lleida, Spain

ABSTRACT   *The Process of Bologna (European Space for Higher Education) has three fundamental nucleuses that are the European cultural diversity, the promotion of the exchange, and the knowledge among people of the different European countries. Neither the European dimension of the higher education nor the search of a system "easily comprehensible and comparable" of degrees are synonymous of homogenization. The debate is open about the Culture concept and the relationships among the diverse cultural groups; among tendencies to assimilation, to relativism, or miscegenation. The Intercultural socialization implies a contradictory and complex wide dialogue, many times, about the values and the norms in the social interactions of people. For this, we should reflect upon the universal thing and the particular thing, upon the importance of the cultural and linguistic diversity in the framework of Interculturality.*

Key-words: *Cultural diversity, intercultural education, ECTS.*

Introduction

Cultural and linguistic diversity in the European Union is a fact that cannot be hidden after a search for a homogeneous image of Europe. We can speak about a European identity or about concurrent European identities. Europe can appear as a diverse unit, grateful as a political will, but also as social and cultural will. The European citizens are those who should perceive this diverse Europe as their own, because if they do not perceive it as so, it will not pass this way of being an entelechy or an administrative situation. It is impossible to follow a model of European construction "from above."

From this perspective, and to illustrate an introduction guided to European diversity, I would like to highlight that we are carrying out a research project, "Telling Europe" (Grundtvig European Program)[1] that has as a main objective to analyze the different perceptions that relate to Europe and "European identity." The theoretical focus that frames the research is Intercultural, beyond assimilation or multicultural limitations.

Thus, the European university construction, through the process of Bologna

cannot be only a continuum of normative ordinances and laws dictated by those responsible for Education and for the Universities of the different countries. It must be lived and shared (being from the beginning main characters) by the professors, the students, and the administration personnel or by the university community and by the society in general.

The European construction, for its consolidation, has a lot to do with the personal and collective experience, in the political, social, and cultural framework: the experience of the sensation, feeling or the idea of Europe in accordance with lived personal events.

Process of Bologna and the Cultural and Linguistic Diversity

The process of Bologna has a fundamental nucleus that relates to the European cultural diversity, the promotion of the exchange and the knowledge among people of the different European countries. Neither the European dimension of higher education nor the search of a system "easily comprehensible and comparable" in terms of degrees and certifications are synonymous of homogenization.

The words and the concepts of the process for the development of the European Space for Higher Education are chosen carefully. Already from the Declaration of the Sorbonne (1998), the necessity to consolidate "a European harmonization" in the Higher Education is mentioned.

In the Declaration of Bologna (1999), the strategic objectives are summed up with concepts that continue without fitting with homogenization or assimilation:

- It talks about creating an easily comprehensible system and "comparable," but not necessarily identical, neither the same for all.
- It speaks about adapting a system of credits "compatible" to promoting mobility (ECTS). The uniformity is not supported, but having aptitude or proportion to converge.
- The idea of approaches and methodologies "comparable" with supporting the European cooperation and fostering the quality of the Higher Education is used. The comparison resides in diversity and concerns the differences and the similarities among several situations.
- Lastly, the objective of the promotion of the mobility of students, professors and administrative personnel of the universities is basic to understand everything.

In this way, the high-priority objective "to harmonize" the European university systems with the purpose that all of them have "homogeneous structures" for bachelor and master degrees stands out.

In fact, there are several models of education. The method of work is the agreement and the consent to be able to reach declarations and agreements like Sorbonne, Bologna, Prague, Berlin or Bergen. Evidently, tensions exist among the different models and proposals and also among the use of the different languages that are spoken in Europe. English appears as new European (and world-wide) Latin, but it is accompanied not only by other official languages of the state members, but also for other co-officials in the diverse participant countries. Anyway, the tension between a certain linguistic homogenization from English, more "global,"

and the heterogeneous wealth of the existing linguistic diversity, maybe more "local," is a reflection of the world tension between the globalization and the community, in relation to cultural diversity ("glocalization").

Cultural Diversity

Cultural diversity is a human and social reality that is far from being a hindrance, but it is rather a potential source of creativity, progress and mutual enrichment (Abad, 1993; Molina, 2002). All human beings are different, but this does not imply that are not equal. Human beings, as social beings, are creators of diverse Culture, or the particular way we have for adapting to the physical and the social environment, and it is an outcome of the social interactions. For that reason, according to the diverse human groups, these ways to adapt are diverse creations. In fact, it is an answer to the environment, and this is changing, so the same concept of Culture (by definition) must be dynamic.

The concept of Culture cannot be so static to conceptualize that it must determine, in a fatal way, human behaviour. A dynamic conception of Culture, as a historical process, can be a way to conceptualize that cultural diversity is enriching and not to keep the traditional cultural relativism that is insufficient. This pretext, regarding the diversity, can only promote ghettos or paternalistic tolerance.

Paralleling to this dynamic conception of Culture, we have to talk about the dynamic conception of Identity. It is a given categorization among the communities. If we apply it to our European society, it gives a process of social categorization of the different countries, and also in relation to the diverse groups of immigrants. There is a construction of the "other one." It becomes the excuse for creating stereotypes and the social sensibility continues to be based on elements of social visibility that can be topical and even stigmas or prejudices.

In this way, it stops using the cultural difference as a social difference (even imbricate to the economic difference), like a process and concept of natural situation. In this sense, and in what concerns overall to migratory processes, they are framed in the global village, but they have -likewise- a local reality, micro social, and a speech created in connection with the perceptions of certain communities about determined groups of people. Cultural diversity appears and finishes translating erroneously as inequality, and does hierarquies about the cultural groups according to stereotypes.

Culture is a system of knowledge. It is a model of the reality that gives order, coherence, integration and address to the social action of the members of a society. Culture is a human phenomenon that contains the symbolic aspects and those learned of the human society: the language and the customs are included. Cultures are combined of forms of life and visions of the world (*Cosmo vision*) that reflect the social experiences of these groups.

With relation to this concept of Culture and of the cultural diversity, there are three basic postures:

1. Ethnocentrism: is when someone thinks that the own culture is the centre of all, the best and more complete, the "natural" one. Under this perspective prejudice attitudes are given from the group to which is belonged, in connection with other groups. Our attitudes, customs and behaviours are con-

sidered (without any critic) superiors.

2. Multiculturalism: describes a situation of coexistence of different cultures in a territory. It is the verification of this cultural diversity. According to multiculturalism all cultures are equally valid, and they cannot be compared. It is based on cultural relativism: norms and values are relative, according to each culture.

3. Interculturalism: implies a dynamic situation of interaction among cultural groups. There is relationship among cultures, with contributions and surrenders, fruit of the negotiation, the consent and the dialogue (*dia logos*).

It is certain that the "multicultural" or "intercultural" terms respond to different bibliographical and academic traditions. So, in occasions, they are used as synonymously (erroneously). The Council of Europe stresses the dynamic shade (and non-relativity) of the Interculturalism. After all, Multiculturalism finishes making reference to a relativism which is not necessarily "integration". So, the need to speak about Interculturalism is evident, to put emphasis in the interaction will, exchange and integration. In short, to name the education (the socialization), the concept Intercultural continues being the most appropriate option (it does not exempt complexities and contradictions), because it indicates in a more precise way this will of acting, of exchanging of communicating.

Interculturalism tries to deepen into the own culture conceptualization, to distinguish diverse elements in Culture. In this sense, in the Culture concept two fundamental functions can be distinguished (Bullivant, 1991; Jordan, 1992):

-   Expressive Culture, as anthropological culture that works as a part of something more static, basically centred in tradition, in customs and lifestyles, in the preservation of a collective identity, etc.

-   Instrumental Culture, as an instrument in continuous evolution that emphasizes the function of survival and adaptation to the environments.

In this way, it is necessary to frame it in the own tension among universalism and relativism that has become worse in modern times, overall at the end of the 20th century and at he beginning of the current 21st century. But it has been a constant of History. It is important the question of whether there are or not universal values or of whether each culture is incommensurable or not. According to Camps (1996), the universality of values does not always imply necessarily that they are presented in only one form. The universal thing and the particular thing seem two seemingly incompatible ways to understand the Human thing.

The question of cultural difference has two conceptions: on the one hand, the differences among cultures seem very evident and impressive. It takes to speculate a form of cultural relativism. On the other hand, it seems that many elements that unite the human beings also exist and that, in this sense, the differences can be shown as secondary variants that, finally, obey a unique and universal function (Scartezzini, 1996: 18). After all, according to the same author, Universalism and Relativism are not a guarantee of defined ideological postures: there is a certain ambiguity, since we can be, even, that some universalisms end in a certain social, political and cultural inequality. In fact, as much the universalism as the relativism has a contradictory character. The modern universalism is based on an individualistic ideology that defends the individual's freedom (emancipated of the collective

dependences). But, finally, it must also defend, for that reason, the difference. The contradictory character of relativism is patent when one affirms that *everything is relative*: this is an absolute statement and, therefore, contradictory with the content (see Scartezzini, 1996).

According to Del Río (1997), the conceived human being, in the last term, as universal and cross-cultural does not exist out of culture. But this confirms universal connotations of mankind. After all, Habermas, from a posture linked to the concept of Modernity, presents some neo-illustrated proposals about the inter-subjective communication. He believes that they complete the Illustration project: it carries out a bet for the universalism, for the universality, with a will of integration of the difference, through the dialogue and the consent.

In conclusion, we can aim at equality and cultural diversity (universalism and particularism, or the social thing and the community thing) are two sides of the same reality and they are, in what Morin denominates "thought of the complexity," the deep truths that are complementary without stopping to be antagonistic (see Del Río, 1997). It is the dialogic sense (*dia logos*), it allows for the maintenance of the duality in the breast of the unit. Through this to speak and to argue continuous we keep formulating the convenient thing and the acceptable thing. This search for dialogue is basic to the social life.

The mere assimilation[2] as a solution to integrate members of minorities (in the educational system, for example) is insufficient and contradictory. We must understand cultural diversity as a positive factor, of enriching our society, and an inalienable right of people.

At this point, we would like to introduce an analogy that illustrates the different models of educational systems that there can be in relation to the socialization in general (Ferdman, 1990; Zabalza, 1992; Molina, 2002): the "socio-educative cuisine".

- "Puree Model": assimilation by acculturation about a hegemonic culture
- "Soup of Vegetables": coexistence of diverse cultural elements.
- "Fondue Model or Melting Pot": selection of best ingredients in each component (of diverse cultures).

It is to be reflected the main tendencies that go from assimilation (acculturation), starting from a hegemonic culture and more powerful, to the possibility of a more equal relationship of coexistence of diverse cultures. The third option is at the same time the most commendable and complex: the existence of a true mixture among different cultural realities in a framework of equality, interrelation, exchange and communication.

The process of Bologna will have to keep incorporating these reflections to fit the projects and realities that are left interweaving.

---

2. In the practice, the assimilation is an inherent factor to the educational system (acculturation). It is necessary to try that this assimilation is minimum and that it is articulate through the dialogue and the negotiation.

Linguistic Diversity

Linguistic diversity usually accompanies cultural diversity, since language is also a part of Culture. On the one hand, language is a great element of the human beings' communication (symbolic capacity). On the other hand, it is also an element of cultural identity, since language is the peculiar creation of a cultural group. The capacity to be expressed vocally and in writing, through signs, or phonemes, and their abstraction means an enormous qualitative jump for humanity. Now then, each group has kept developing this symbolic capacity through the fact of sharing signs, phonemes, and different words to designate those same things and those same facts.

Therefore we can speak about a certain unity in the diversity, or of a diversity based on a symbolic capacity common to mankind. We speak of biodiversity (above all when we refer to ecosystems), and of the importance that has to preserve and respect this diversity: we can establish a parallelism to understand the importance of the diversity of cultures and of linguistic diversity, as on source of humanity's enrichment.

In relation to Europe, we will focus on some very recent data, of the last Eurobarometer carried out in 2005 about the linguistic diversity in Europe[3]. Later on we will see that, although some sensibility exists to it, in practice there are difficulties so, in the process of Bologna, which reflect this situation in general, and in particular, in the exchanges of, mainly, students.

In Europe linguistic diversity is proverbial. Most citizens of the 25 states members of the EU have as a mother tongue, the language of their state. But there are numerous exceptions: there are citizens of the Baltic republics that have as a mother tongue Russian; in Belgium, Ireland, Luxemburg and Finland have several official languages, and in Spain, in the respective autonomous communities. In this last case, the study sums up the Catalan's examples (9%) and the Basque (1%). Likewise, it stands out the growing importance of immigration, indicating that for some citizens of the EU their mother tongue is the language of their origin country, outside the EU, highlighting the case in countries with strong immigration like Germany, France, and the United Kingdom.

Another very interesting and developing consideration for this study of linguistic diversity in Europe is that half of the citizens of the states members can speak a language different from their mother tongue at least, being able to maintain a conversation.

Most citizens that speak this second language are accustomed to coming from relatively small states as Luxemburg, Lithuania, Latvia and Malt, with more than the population's 90%. On the other hand in countries like Hungary or United Kingdom only the population's 70% speak a second language. In Spain, Italy and Portugal, it represents 64%. The most widely-known language -excluding the mother tongue- within the European Union is English (34%), continued by German (12%) and French (11%); Spanish and Russian which each one represent 5%.

---

3. European Commission (2005): *Europeans and Languages.* Eurobarometer. 63.4. September, 2005. TNS Opinion & Social (Taylor Nelson Sofres and EOS Gallup Europe).

In general terms, English is the most spoken foreign language in 16 of the States members, and it is also the one that is mentioned more often as first foreign language. Slovakia is the only country where English is not mentioned among the three more spoken languages. French is the most known foreign language in the United Kingdom and Luxemburg, and German in the Czech Republic and Hungary. Another fact to be kept in mind is that the integration of the 10 new States has increased the linguistic diversity in the European Union.

Keeping in mind the social-demographic variables, we can observe that men speak a second language in a wider proportion than the women (52% in front of 47%) and that the youngest in general overcome the proportions of the older adults (among 15-24 years, 69% of them speak a second language, and among those older than 55 years, only 35%).

In this sense, it is necessary to highlight the importance of schooling, since among the youths; those that stopped studying at the 15 years represent only 20% of those that speak a second language, in front of those who are still studying and who represent 79%. It should also be highlighted that there is a bigger proportion among the inhabitants of large towns (55%) than among those who live in rural areas (47%).

In relation to the languages more commonly used in the European Union, we can highlight English in the first place: 47% of European population speaks English; German (30%); French (23%); Italian (15%); Spanish (14%) and Polish (10%).

Linguistic diversity is a reality in the European Union. This diversity goes beyond the official languages of the States and of those "own" languages of the same European Union.

The process of Bologna in general, and the potentiality of the exchanges Erasmus-Socrates and Erasmus-Mundus in particular, must keep in mind everything in order to promote and facilitate the mobility among students, professors and personal of administration.

Construction of Interculturality

Higher Education is a period of the Educational System and, as such, a key issue in the socialization of the citizens, as integral of society. We usually associate Modernity with the emergency of the "individual", overcoming the representation of the "community person", in the collective (according to the Tönnies' types). The modern individual is characterized, on the contrary, by a grade of social differentiation and of growing rationalization. Socialization leads to a growing individuation and to differentiation.

Identities are built through an individualization process by the same actors who are sense sources (Giddens, 1995). According to Castells (1998), there are three origins of the social construction of identity, keeping in mind that this is always framed in a context wrapped by relationships of power:

- Legitimate Identity: starting from the dominant institutions that seek to rationalize their dominance before the social actors

- Resistance Identity: starting from the actors that are in positions stigmatized by the logic of the dominance. They resist through different principles from

those of the institutions of the society

- Project Identity: starting from the social actors that are based on cultural materials to build a new identity that redefines their position in the society. They look for the transformation of the social structures.

This classification allows us to articulate the dynamism of the construction of the identities. They cannot be understood as an essence. And this is important, from the Sociology point of view, for the last positions of an Intercultural education that overcome Multiculturalism.

This debate must take root in the reflection about the Resistance identity that leads to the formation of communes or communities. In this way, the frontier of exclusion is reinforced (of the "other ones", of the "different ones", of the "immigrants"). We must work on reciprocal communication among these identities. This must be guided towards the Project-Identity, which produces fellows and allows us to see the transformation of society.

The idea of the fellow's construction, as a desire to be an individual and to create a personal history, it does not invalidate the double statement of recognizing, on the one hand (Touraine, 1997) that the fellows are the collective social actor through which the individuals get a holistic sense in their experience. And, on the other hand, the own identity is not a distinctive characteristic that the individual possesses (Giddens, 1995), but rather the "me" like reflexive project, according to their own biography. Nevertheless, Castells indicates that although he agrees with Giddens on the theoretical characterization of the construction of the identity in the period of the late modernity, he believes that the ascent of the Net-society makes objections about these processes of construction of identity.

Culture and Identity would be considered again as something static (see Anthias, 1999). We believe that the consideration of socialization and the construction of identity as dynamic and dialectical processes between the individual and society (in the framework of talkative situations and as a project-identity), which allow for an alternative orientation in the late modernity (or in the Net-society). These theoretical and conceptual arguments, from a sociological speech, allow us to choose clarifying elements of debate in the face of Multiculturalism that not only serve as reflection and incentive for new meta-theoretical contributions, but also as implications more or less concrete of analyses, above all -not only- in the field of education.

Diverse sociologists and social scientists in general, put emphasis in the idea that the real integration can only be understood in a total process, not unidirectional. This would imply the confusion or last contradiction of considering the integration concept as a synonym for assimilation.

Anyway and ultimately, what is presented is a clear difficulty in meditating if it must conserve statically and integrally the culture of the immigrant groups, and/or of any other group, in general. At first, culture is a solid and fundamental point of reference for the own security and recognition as individuals and as a collective. But, in fact, the current culture of immigrant groups is transforming with the daily contact with other realities.

Intercultural sensitization and the student's integral formation as a person and a citizen are very important. In short, it is to reinforce the idea of the new method-

ological focus that should be based more on the learning than on the teaching, in a more interactive framework. According to the process of Bologna, the university system must imply more implication and the student's autonomy, the use of more active and more diverse methodologies (practical cases, work in teams, seminars, etc.), in stimulating learning environments.

Conclusions

Keeping in mind the guidelines of the process of Bologna in the framework of the European Space of Higher Education, we should highlight that Universities play a role of vanguard of thought and reference of models and solutions for the incorporation in the Society of the Knowledge. In this sense, it is specified that the students, "thanks to their capacity of adaptation," are the true main characters of the change. It is so, because developing is also, according to Margaret Mead, a Society of Pre-figurative Culture, where youths play a crucial role in the socialization to which we would add, "Intercultural."

The concept of Intercultural socialization (keeping in mind the importance of what the transmission of values, norms and attitudes mean) must overcome the traditional conceptualization of Durkheim: Socialization (Education) is given from the adult generations to the youngest. This would be only a case of socialization or, somehow, an incomplete way of interpreting it. In this sense, we pick up Margaret Mead's contributions when establishing three society types, according to a classification of continuity or discontinuity of norms and patterns:

- *Societies of Post-figurative Culture:* It couches to always reproduce the culture. The important things are continuity and tradition. They are relatively more static societies. The credibility has it people with vital experience, the old person… The experience of life is very important, and helps to have a wider vision of events.

- *Societies of Co-figurative Culture:* A more horizontal relationship is given. The traditional culture is not as much relevant as the applied technique (the "experts"). In other words, one can teach and transmit something on which he or she is well-prepared, and in other occasions, he or she can receive formation and education on other areas which are not that specialized.

- *Societies of Pre-figurative Culture* Young people are those who give the information. Among other paradigmatic situations, we must highlight those related with the Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) and the migrations. The youngest have a bigger plasticity and flexibility: they live in the social change.

As we have indicated previously, and just as it is guiding the process of Bologna and the European Higher Education, the young students, "by their capacity of adaptation", are a key piece in this situation. Cultural diversity is a factor of personal and collective enrichment, and of the own educational institutions.

This cultural diversity is not able to finish in a homogeneity or assimilation. The integration is global because it affects all, minorities and majorities, while assimilation is a unidirectional process.

Intercultural socialization must imply an education in solidarity and equality (beyond a tolerance and a paternalistic understanding) in a society more than mul-

ticultural. Intercultural socialization pleads for dialogue and communication and, far from a multicultural static positioning; it seeks to propose alternatives that help in this relation dynamics. Intercultural speech must be trigger of real integration. In this sense, we insist on the theoretical pattern of Flecha that also frames three models of social integration and that we link to the process of Bologna, to meditate on the performance orientations to continue:

- *Perspective of Ethnocentrism:* This model denies multiculturalism, regards integration as assimilation to the majorities of the country, or of the European Union, in this case. Education must be obligatory and defend the human rights as universal. The quotas for the minorities (affirmative action) are put into question because they damage individual interests. We could summarize that this is the initial pattern of modernity, in which the educational system appears as the ideal of equality of opportunities, but also as a homogenization sense.

- *Perspective of the Cultural Relativism.* This model represents the denominated strong multiculturalism: outlines the difference as nucleus of relationships. The denominated human rights are not recognized as universal because it is considered that they are fruit of a western creation. It appears as the pattern of the post-modernity.

- *Talkative Perspective or Intercultural Universalism:* This model represents the denominated weak multiculturalism, although it tries to overcome the intercultural concept. It is positioned in defence of the human rights as universal, and of equality above differences. It does not believe that it is enough the position only as individuals, but also as members of a collective. It is based on negotiation, consent, dialogue... in communication. It appears as the pattern of "late modernity" or "advanced modernity".

In the process of Bologna, the Higher Education can keep in mind some elements of the first perspective, above all in relation to the equality and the right for education; but it should grant relevance to cultural and linguistic diversity. In this sense, for the exchanges of Socrates-Erasmus, they are organized special courses in summer for all the European languages. However, as the Catalan, the Basque and the Galician (for example) they are not official languages of the European Union, there is not funding from Europe to participate in these summer courses. There are other initiatives that try to look after the plural-lingual. It is the case of the program Erasmus-Mundus; there has to be a second language of the European Union.

Anyway, multiculturalism and the difficulty in developing a real interculturality, resides in fundamental and not resolved questions as the fact of valuing to what extent the defence of the cultural group reduces or not individual integration (and, therefore, collective). After all, the integration models range from two in a gradation opposed and extreme poles, as they are the total assimilation and the radical rejection to any integration type or change toward a community integration (of the EU, for example). The socialization processes (intercultural) must organize according to a universal lattice: so it is evident that people are equal in the same way as people are different.

European Space for Higher Education (from a global, sociological, anthropological and pedagogic point of view) must keep in mind cultural and linguistic

diversity[4]. Now then, the fact of assuming this diversity does not necessarily only imply to treat the individuals as integral of a culture. Education must have a universal focus, but also an individualized treatment, respecting and accompanying the person as an individual, in the construction of the "subject" (Touraine, 1997): recognizing the importance of the individuality without denying the cultural diversity that would be always in the framework of equality. In fact, the implementation and development of the ECTS offer integration and individuation: the student conforms their own curriculum in a common, but very wide framework, with some minima comparable of equality that allows for the recognition of holding. Universalism and diversity are not excluding, but rather mutually reinforced.

In fact, all that exposed along the article allows to rush a concrete proposal in relation to the plans of study of the faculties of Sciences of the Education, in graduate degrees related with Teaching's studies, Social Education, Psycho -pedagogy, etc… we outline the relevancy of developing a Sociology of Intercultural Education under the parameters that we have gone indicating along our article. Some parameters of critical and reflexive formation. The Sociology of Intercultural Education, in this sense, should have as objective the study, the analysis and the reflection on the education, keeping in mind that this is education for *alter*, in the difference. Nevertheless, the difference must be synonymous of inequality; in this sense, the cultural difference, for example, it cannot become social hierarchies. The debate and the critical sense will have to be present to know and to value concepts critically like those of culture, identity, multiculturalism, *interculturality*, citizenship, participation, formation, integration and socialization, among others. In this sense, the incorporation of the Sociology of Intercultural Education like ECTS of graduate degrees of Education, it can already complete some parallel functions to those of the classic or traditional Sociology of Education, being able to be revulsion for this and for the education in general.

It is certain, on the other hand, that when processes of common spaces are developed (Higher Education in European Union), they stop generating uniform tendencies that press towards a certain homogenization: the case of English, among linguistic diversity, and the case of some models or cultural traditions of universities. But it is also certain that, in this tension between centrifugal forces and centripetal forces, cultural and linguistic diversity play an enriching role. This enriching role can be lived as conflicting, but positively, as a developing engine and opening of alternative and knowledge. In fact, cultural miscegenation is the most frequent thing in humanity's History and it has been shown as producing positive changes and development.

In conclusion, when we speak of the European Space for Higher Education, we project all these reflections and complex situations. Performance lines are given to recognize the importance of cultural and linguistic diversity. In the European Union the system of studies is flexible, so that each student -as we have indicated previously- can design their own curriculum, based on a structure of degrees and credits, "harmonica and comparable, with a wide offer of courses and contents, as

---

4. You must highlight, in this sense, the talkative proposals of Habermas. Beck also defends the necessity of a reorientation European cosmopolitan, for example.

well as of degrees combined and double degrees". This, put into practice, implies recognition of the diversity in Higher Education which is a key in the construction of a new "European Citizenship", of Europe based on knowledge, as a basic factor for human and social development "reinforcing the conscience of the shared values at the same time and of the ownership to a common social and cultural space, Europe." It does not refer to unique culture, but to a common "cultural space". It is the idea of the construction of an Identity-project that articulates the diversity in the community… in a common and heterogeneous social and cultural space.

References

ABAD, A. (1993): "La educación intercultural como propuesta de integración", en Abad, L.; Cucó, A. e Izquierdo, A.: *Inmigración, pluralismo y tolerancia.* Madrid, Editorial Popular, 11-69.

ANTHIAS, F. (1999): "Theorising identity, difference and social divisions", en O'Brian, M.; Penna, S., y Hay, C. (eds): *Theorising Modernity.* Nueva York, Addison Wesley Longman, 156-178.

BECK, U. (2005): *La mirada cosmopolita o la guerra es la paz.* Barcelona, Paidós.

CAMPS, V. (1996): "La universalidad ética y sus enemigos", en Giner, S. y Scartezzini, R. (eds): *Universalidad y diferencia.* Madrid, Alianza, 137-153.

CASTELLS, M. (1996): *The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture (3 volumes).* Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

CONSEJO DE COORDINACIÓN UNIVERSITARIA (2005): *Espacio Europeo de Educación Superior (EEES).* Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia.

DEL RÍO, E. (1997): *Modernidad, postmodernidad.* Madrid, Talasa.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION (2005): *Europeans and Languages.* Eurobarometer 63.4, September, 2005. (TNS Opinion & Social – Taylor Nelson Sofres and EOS Gallup Europe).

FLECHA, R. (1997): "Desigualdad, diferencia e identidad: más allá del discurso de la diversidad", en *Pedagogía crítica: malestar y ocultación.* Universidad de Lleida, 77-96.

GIGGENS, A. (1991): *Modernity and Self-Identity. Self and Society in the Late Modern Age.* Cambridge, Polity Press.

HABERMAS, J. (1992): *Teoría de la Acción Comunicativa* (Vol. I: *Racionalidad de la acción y racionalización social*; Vol. II: *Crítica de la razón funcionalista*). Madrid, Taurus.

JORDÁN, J. A. (1992): *L'Educació Multicultural.* Barcelona, Ceac.

MARRAMAO, G. (1996): "Universalismo y políticas de la diferencia. La democracia como comunidad paradójica", en Giner, S. y Scartezzini, G. (eds): *Universalidad y diferencia.* Madrid, Alianza, 81-96.

MEAD, M. (1971): *Cultura y compromiso. Estudio sobre la rotura generacional.* Buenos Aires, Granica.

MOLINA, F. (2002): *Sociología de la Educación Intercultural.* Buenos Aires, Lumen.

MORIN, E. (2000): *La mente bien ordenada.* Barcelona, Seix Barral. (*La téte bien faite. Repenser la réforme. Réformer la pensée.* -1999- Paris, Seuil).

SCARTEZZINI, G. (1996): "Las razones de la universalidad y las de la diferencia", en

Giner, S. y Scartezzini, R. (eds): *Universalidad y diferencia.* Madrid, Alianza, 17-32.

TERRACIANO, A. & MCCRAE, R. (2005): "The Nature of Personality: Genes, Culture and National Character". *Science.* 310, numb. 5745 (October, 2005).

TOURAINE, A. (1997): *Pourrons-nous vivre ensemble? Égaux et différents.* Paris, Librairie Arthème Fayard.

ZABALZA, M.A. (1992): "Implicaciones curriculares de la Educación Intercultural", en *Educación Intercultural en la Perspectiva de la Europa Unida.* X Congreso de Pedagogía, *1,* 329-349.

CULTURAL AND LINGUISTIC DIVERSITY IN HIGHER EDUCATION

This article is fruit of two researches: "Theories and Dialogic Societies. TSD" (National Program of Science Research and Technologic Innovation 2003-2006: BSO2003-04116/CPSO), and "Telling Europe", inside the European program Socrates Grundtvig 2 (05-ESP01-S2G01-05102-1). PhD Fidel Molina is the main researcher (MS-IP) of the group of research at the University of Lleida (Spain), and coordinator of the GESEC (Group of Studies Society, Education and Culture). The project "Telling Europe" is coordinated by the professor of Sociology at the UPTER of Rome, Andrea Ciantar. The participant countries are: Germany (Berlin), Belgium (Brussels), Spain (La Roca del Vallés-Barcelona and Lleida) and Italy (Rome and Melfi). The project "Telling Europe" has received the prize "Grundtvig Award 2005" of the EAEA (European Association for Education of Adults).

PhD Fidel MOLINA (University of Lleida – Spain). Professor of Sociology. Dean of the Faculty of Education (1998-2001 and 2001-2004). He's member of Comity of Experts about Formation of Human Recourses (Government of Catalonia) and he's member of the Spanish Sociology Federation (FES) and ESA (European Sociological Association). Among the fields on which he has published are Sociology of Education, Intercultural Relations, Social and Cultural Identity, Conflict Management, Sport and Leisure, and Socialization. Much of his work is about Sociology of Intercultural Education, in European and international context. Among his relevant publications are *Youth and Community: Conscripts' Festivals and Their Contradictions* (Journal of Youth Studies, JYS, 2001), *Entre l'Identité et l'Identification: un problème complexe de la recherche sociologique dans le domaine de l'Interculturalité* (Sociétés, 2002); *Sociología de la Educación Intercultural* (Buenos Aires, Lumen, 2002); *Nuevos Conflictos socials y su presencia educative. Análisis sociológico y reflexiones para la intervención* (C&E, 2005); *"From Educational Divide to Digital Divide: How to Prevent the Reproduction of the Traditional Class, Gender and Cultural Community in the Information Society"* (ESA, Torun, 2005).

Address for correspondence: PhD Fidel Molina. Faculty of Education. Department of Sociology. University of Lleida. Campus Caparrella. 25192-Lleida (Spain). Tel.: +34 973 70 20 98; Fax: +34 973 70 23 05. E-mail: molina@geosoc.udl.es